

The Uncertainty Principle for certain densities ^{*}

Oleg Kovrizhkin [†]

MIT, 2-273
Math Dept
77 Mass Ave
Cambridge, MA 02139, USA
E-mail address: oleg@math.mit.edu

Abstract

We prove a new version of the Uncertainty Principle of the form $\int |f|^2 \lesssim \int_{E^c} |f|^2 + \int_{\Sigma^c} |\hat{f}|^2$ where the sets E and Σ are ϵ -thin in the following sense: $|E \cap D(x, \rho_1(x))| \leq \epsilon |D(x, \rho_1(x))|$ and $|\Sigma \cap D(x, \rho_2(x))| \leq \epsilon |D(x, \rho_2(x))|$. This is an intermediate result between Logvinenko-Sereda's and Wolff's versions of the Uncertainty Principle.

1 Introduction

The Uncertainty Principle in Fourier analysis is a statement that a function and its Fourier transform can not both be concentrated on small sets. Many examples of this principle can be found in the book by Havin and Jorjick [4] and in the paper by Folland and Sitaram [3]. We will be interested in the following type of the Uncertainty Principle for $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$:

$$\int |f|^2 \leq C \left(\int_{E^c} |f|^2 + \int_{\Sigma^c} |\hat{f}|^2 \right) \quad (1)$$

^{*}1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 42A99, 42B99.

Key words and phrases. Uncertainty Principle, Logvinenko-Sereda theorem, relatively dense sets, ϵ -thin sets.

[†]This research was partially supported by NSF grant DMS 0201099

where E and Σ are “small” sets in $\mathbb{R}^d$, E^c and Σ^c are complements of E and Σ and C is independent of f . In particular, it follows that if $\text{supp} f \subset E$ and $\text{supp} \hat{f} \subset \Sigma$ then $f \equiv 0$. We will use the following definition of the Fourier transform: $\hat{f}(x) = \int f(y) e^{-i2\pi x \cdot y} dy$ and the corresponding inverse Fourier transform: $\check{f}(x) = \int f(y) e^{i2\pi x \cdot y} dy$. There are several examples of the Uncertainty Principle of form (1). One of them is the Amrein-Berthier theorem ([4], p.97), [1] (which is a quantitative version of a result due to Benedicks [2]). In this theorem sets of finite measure play the role of small sets, i.e., if a function f is supported on a set of finite measure then $\hat{f}$ can not be concentrated on a set of finite measure unless f is the zero function. The quantitative version of this theorem says that

$$\int |f|^2 \leq C \left(\int_{E^c} |f|^2 + \int_{\Sigma^c} |\hat{f}|^2 \right)$$

where E and Σ are sets of finite measure and the constant C doesn't depend on f . It is interesting to note that the optimal estimate of C , which depends only on measures $|E|$ and $|F|$, was obtained by F. Nazarov relatively recently [9].

Two more examples of the Uncertainty Principle which are of particular interest to us are the Logvinenko-Sereda theorem ([4], p.112), [8] and Wolff's theorem [12]. In the case of the Logvinenko-Sereda theorem compact sets and the complements of relatively dense subsets play the role of small sets. A measurable set $E^c \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is called relatively dense if there exist a disc D and $\gamma > 0$ such that

$$|E^c \cap (D + x)| \geq \gamma \cdot |D| \quad (2)$$

for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. It is intuitively clear that E is a small set in a certain sense. The theorem states that if $\hat{f}$ is supported in a compact set Σ and a set E^c is relatively dense then

$$\int |f|^2 \leq C(E, \Sigma) \int_{E^c} |f|^2 \quad (3)$$

where $C(E, \Sigma)$ depends only on E and Σ but doesn't depend on f . It is a well-known fact that relative density (2), or “thickness”, of E^c is also necessary for the inequality (3) to hold. See for example ([4], p.113). The

Logvinenko-Sereda theorem, which was motivated by the theory of PDE's, is a result of the theory of entire functions of exponential type. In his earlier paper [5] the author found a new proof of the Logvinenko-Sereda theorem and obtained a sharp estimate of C in (3) which is polynomial in terms of the density γ : $C \sim \frac{1}{\gamma^a}$ rather than a previously known exponential one: $C \sim \exp \frac{1}{\gamma^b}$ (see for example the text book by Havin and Jorické ([4], p.112)). The author showed that his estimate is optimal in terms of γ , size of D and size of Σ . The author further generalized the inequality (3) for the case of Fourier transforms supported in the union of finitely many compact sets ($\hat{f} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n (\Sigma + \lambda_i)$) with an estimate of C depending only on the number of the sets but not how they are placed [5], [6]. In his other paper [7] the author extended the inequality (3) to non-compactly supported Fourier transforms which are supported in an infinite sequence of lacunarily-placed compact sets ($\hat{f} \subset \bigcup_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} (\Sigma + \lambda_i)$ where $\Lambda = \{\lambda_i\}_{i=-\infty}^{\infty}$ is a lacunary sequence in $\mathbb{R}^d$).

In Wolff's theorem ([12], Theorem 2.1) so called ϵ -thin sets rather than relatively dense ones play the role of small sets. Let $\rho(x) = \min(1, \frac{1}{|x|})$. A set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is called ϵ -thin if

$$|E \cap D(x, \rho(x))| \leq \epsilon |D(x, \rho(x))|$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where $D(x, r)$ is the disc centered at x with radius r . The theorem says that if ϵ is small enough and E and Σ are ϵ -thin then

$$\int |f|^2 \leq C \left(\int_{E^c} |f|^2 + \int_{\Sigma^c} |\hat{f}|^2 \right) \quad (4)$$

where C is a universal constant.

Our main result is a new version of the Uncertainty Principle which links the Logvinenko-Sereda theorem and Wolff's theorem. Suppose $\rho_1 : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\rho_2 : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ are continuous non-increasing functions and there exist $C_1 > 0$, $C_2 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{C_2}{\rho_2(\frac{C_1}{\rho_1(t)})} \geq t \quad (5)$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Since the functions ρ_1 and ρ_2 are continuous and non-increasing, we also have

$$\frac{C_1}{\rho_1(\frac{C_2}{\rho_2(t)})} \geq t$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Clearly, $\rho_1(t) \rightarrow 0$ and $\rho_2(t) \rightarrow 0$ when $t \rightarrow \infty$. As an example we can take $\rho_1(t) = \min(\frac{1}{t^a}, 1)$ and $\rho_2(t) = \min(\frac{1}{t^a}, 1)$ where $a > 0$. Denote by $D(x, r)$ the disc centered at $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ of radius r . We call a pair of sets $E, \Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ϵ -thin with respect to the pair of functions ρ_1 and ρ_2 if

$$\begin{aligned} |E \cap D(x, \rho_1(|x|))| &\leq \epsilon |D(x, \rho_1(|x|))| \\ \text{and} \\ |\Sigma \cap D(x, \rho_2(|x|))| &\leq \epsilon |D(x, \rho_2(|x|))| \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Note that the complements of E and Σ possess some sort of density $\gamma = 1 - \epsilon$ with respect to discs $D(x, \rho_1(|x|))$ and $D(x, \rho_2(|x|))$ correspondingly. Our main result is the following

Theorem 1 *If ρ_1 and ρ_2 satisfy (5) then there exist $\epsilon > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that for any pair of ϵ -thin sets E and Σ with respect to ρ_1 and ρ_2 as in (6) we have*

$$\int |f|^2 \leq C \left(\int_{E^c} |f|^2 + \int_{\Sigma^c} |\hat{f}|^2 \right) \tag{7}$$

for every $f \in L^2$.

Note that the inequality (5) is scale invariant in the following sense. If we replace $f(x)$ with $\tilde{f}(x) = f(kx)$ then replace E with $\tilde{E} = kE$ and Σ with $\tilde{\Sigma} = \frac{1}{k}\Sigma$ where $k > 0$. Then $\tilde{E}$ and $\tilde{\Sigma}$ are ϵ -thin with respect to $\tilde{\rho}_1(t) = k\rho_1(\frac{t}{k})$ and $\tilde{\rho}_2(t) = \frac{1}{k}\rho_2(kt)$. It is easy to check that the inequality (5) is preserved: $\frac{C_2}{\tilde{\rho}_2(\frac{C_1}{\tilde{\rho}_1(t)})} \geq t$ for all $t \geq 0$.

As an application of **Theorem 1** we obtain the following result which is a generalization of Theorem 2.3 in [12]. If G is a function on $\mathbb{R}^d$, $\|G\|_\infty = 1$, define an operator $T_G : L^2 \rightarrow L^2$ as

$$T_G f = \widehat{Gf}.$$

Then $\|T_G\|_2 = 1$. The next theorem shows that under certain condition on G and H we have $\|T_H T_G\|_2 < 1$.

Theorem 2 *Suppose μ_1 and μ_2 are probability measures on the real line, which are not δ -measures. Let G and H be functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying*

$$|G(x)| \leq |\hat{\mu}_1(|x|^p)|,$$

$$|H(x)| \leq |\hat{\mu}_2(|x|^{p'})|$$

where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$, $1 < p < \infty$. Then

$$\|T_H T_G\|_2 \leq \beta < 1$$

where β depends only on μ_1 , μ_2 and p .

2 Proof of Theorems 1 and 2

We will construct a pair of bounded operators S and T on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying the following conditions: $\|S\chi_E f\|_2^2 \leq \alpha(\epsilon)\|f\|_2^2$ and $\|\chi_\Sigma \widehat{Tf}\|_2^2 \leq \beta(\epsilon)\|f\|_2^2$ where $\alpha(\epsilon) \lesssim (C_1^d + 1)\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ and $\beta(\epsilon) \lesssim (C_2^d + 1)\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ and such that $S + T$ is the identity operator. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_2^2 = \|\hat{f}\|_2^2 &= \|\chi_{\Sigma^c} \hat{f}\|_2^2 + \|\chi_\Sigma \hat{f}\|_2^2 \\ &= \|\chi_{\Sigma^c} \hat{f}\|_2^2 + \|\chi_\Sigma (\widehat{Sf} + \widehat{Tf})\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \|\chi_{\Sigma^c} \hat{f}\|_2^2 + 2\|\chi_\Sigma \widehat{Sf}\|_2^2 + 2\|\chi_\Sigma \widehat{Tf}\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \|\chi_{\Sigma^c} \hat{f}\|_2^2 + 2\|Sf\|_2^2 + 2\beta(\epsilon)\|f\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \|\chi_{\Sigma^c} \hat{f}\|_2^2 + 4\|S\chi_{E^c} f\|_2^2 + 4\|S\chi_E f\|_2^2 + 2\beta(\epsilon)\|f\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \|\chi_{\Sigma^c} \hat{f}\|_2^2 + C\|\chi_{E^c} f\|_2^2 + 4(\alpha(\epsilon) + \beta(\epsilon))\|f\|_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

We used here the fact that S is a bounded operator on L^2 and therefore $\|S\chi_{E^c} f\|_2 \lesssim \|\chi_{E^c} f\|_2$. If ϵ is small enough so that $4(\alpha(\epsilon) + \beta(\epsilon)) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ then we obtain the desired result

$$\int |f|^2 \lesssim \int_{E^c} |f|^2 + \int_{\Sigma^c} |\hat{f}|^2.$$

The theorem contains Wolff's theorem and the Logvinenko-Sereda theorem mentioned in the introduction as two extreme cases. To show this consider $\rho_1(t) = \min(\frac{1}{t^n}, 1)$ and $\rho_2(t) = \min(\frac{1}{t^n}, 1)$ where $n > 0$ then $\frac{1}{\rho_2(\frac{1}{\rho_1(t)})} \geq t$. Here $C_1 = C_2 = 1$. If $n = 1$ we get Wolff's result. The Logvinenko-Sereda theorem is obtained if we let $n \rightarrow \infty$ since $\rho_1(t) \rightarrow 1$ and $\rho_2(t) \rightarrow \chi_{[0,1]}(t)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, i.e., if E is the complement of a relatively dense set such that $|E \cap (D + x)| \leq \epsilon|D|$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ where $D = D(0, 1)$ then E is ϵ -thin with respect to $\rho_1(t) = 1$ and if a set $\Sigma \subset \epsilon \cdot D$ then Σ is ϵ -thin with respect to $\rho_2(t) = \chi_{[0,1]}(t)$. Note that if sets E and Σ are ϵ -thin with respect to $\rho_1(t) = 1$ and $\rho_2(t) = \chi_{[0,1]}(t)$ correspondingly then E is the complement of a relatively dense set and $\Sigma \subset D$. Now we will justify passing to the limit. Suppose E is the complement of a relatively dense set such that $|E \cap (D + x)| \leq \epsilon|D|$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and a set $\Sigma \subset \epsilon \cdot D$. Let $E_n = E \cap D(0, n)$ and $\Sigma_n = \Sigma$ then E_n and Σ_n are 2ϵ -thin with respect to $\rho_1(t) = \min(\frac{1}{t^n}, 1)$ and $\rho_2(t) = \min(\frac{1}{t^n}, 1)$ correspondingly for large enough n . Then there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that for all large enough n we have

$$\int |f|^2 \leq C \left(\int_{E_n^c} |f|^2 + \int_{\Sigma_n^c} |\hat{f}|^2 \right)$$

where C does not depend on n since all constants in the theorem are uniform in n for these pairs of ρ_1 and ρ_2 . Using $\int_{E_n^c} |f|^2 \rightarrow \int_{E^c} |f|^2$ and $\int_{\Sigma_n^c} |\hat{f}|^2 = \int_{\Sigma^c} |\hat{f}|^2$ we get the Logvinenko-Sereda theorem

$$\int |f|^2 \lesssim \int_{E^c} |f|^2 + \int_{\Sigma^c} |\hat{f}|^2.$$

Now we will show how to construct a pair of such operators S and T . We will use some technique from ([12], Theorem 2.1). Let $\psi_0 : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a radial Schwartz function supported in $D(0, 2)$ such that $\psi_0 \equiv 1$ in $D(0, 1)$ and $0 \leq \psi_0 \leq 1$. In addition, we assume that $q(|x|) = \psi_0(x)$ is a non-increasing function of $|x|$ where $q(r)$ is a function defined on $\mathbb{R}^+$. We will use the last property only to prove (23) in **Lemma 3**. Define $\psi_j(x) = \psi_0(\frac{x}{2^j}) - \psi_0(\frac{x}{2^{j+1}})$ for integer $j \geq 1$. It is clear that $\psi_j(x)$ is supported in $2^{j-1} \leq |x| \leq 2^{j+1}$ and $\sum_{j \geq 0} \psi_j \equiv 1$. Define $\phi = \check{\psi}_0$ and $\phi_j(x) = C_1^d \rho_1^{-d}(2^j) \phi(\frac{C_1 x}{\rho_1(2^j)})$. Define the

operators S and T on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ in the following way:

$$Sf = \sum_{j \geq 0} \psi_j \cdot (\phi_{j-1} * f) \quad (9)$$

and

$$Tf = \sum_{j \geq 0} \psi_j \cdot (f - \phi_{j-1} * f). \quad (10)$$

Note that the infinite sums in (9) and (10) converge pointwise since they have at most three nonvanishing terms at a given point. It is also clear that $Sf + Tf \equiv f$. We have

$$Sf(x) = \int K(x, y) f(y) dy$$

where

$$K(x, y) = \sum_{j \geq 0} \psi_j(x) \phi_{j-1}(x - y). \quad (11)$$

We also have

$$\widehat{Tf}(x) = \int L(x, y) \hat{f}(y) dy$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} L(x, y) &= \sum_{j \geq 0} \hat{\psi}_j(x - y) (1 - \hat{\phi}_{j-1}(y)) \\ &= \phi(x - y) (1 - \hat{\phi}_{-1}(y)) + \sum_{j \geq 1} (2^{jd} \phi(2^j(x - y)) - 2^{(j-1)d} \phi(2^{j-1}(x - y))) (1 - \hat{\phi}_{j-1}(y)) \\ &= \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{jd} \phi(2^j(x - y)) (\hat{\phi}_j(y) - \hat{\phi}_{j-1}(y)) \\ &= \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{jd} \phi(2^j(x - y)) (\psi_0(\rho_1(2^j)y/C_1) - \psi_0(\rho_1(2^{j-1})y/C_1)). \end{aligned} \quad (12) \quad (13)$$

We used here $\hat{\psi}_j(z) = 2^{jd} \hat{\psi}_0(2^j z) - 2^{(j-1)d} \hat{\psi}_0(2^{j-1} z) = 2^{jd} \phi(2^j z) - 2^{(j-1)d} \phi(2^{j-1} z)$ for $j \geq 1$, summation by parts and $\hat{\phi}_j(y) = \psi_0(\rho_1(2^j)y/C_1)$. Note that for

a fixed y the sums in (12) and (13) have only finitely many terms since $\hat{\phi}_j(y) = \psi_0(\rho_1(2^j)y/C_1) = 1$ if $|y| \leq \frac{C_1}{\rho_1(2^j)}$ and $\frac{C_1}{\rho_1(2^j)} \rightarrow \infty$ when $j \rightarrow \infty$. The four lemmas below are analogous to Lemma 2.2 in [12].

Now we will show that S is a bounded operator on L^2 . It will suffice to prove the following lemma:

Lemma 1

$$\sup_x \int |K(x, y)| dy \leq C \quad (14)$$

and

$$\sup_y \int |K(x, y)| dx \leq C. \quad (15)$$

where C is an absolute constant which does not depend on ρ_1 .

Proof of Lemma 1. (14) follows from the facts that for a fixed x the sum in (11) contains at most three nonvanishing terms, $|\psi_j| \leq 1$ and $\|\phi_j\|_1 = \|\phi\|$. Therefore,

$$\sup_x \int |K(x, y)| dy \leq 3\|\phi\|_1.$$

Fix y and note that there are at most four values of j such that $\text{dist}(y, \text{supp } \psi_j) < 2^{j-2}$. Call this set of j 's A . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \int |K(x, y)| dx &\leq 4\|\phi\|_1 + \sum_{j \notin A} \int |\psi_j(x)| \cdot |\phi_{j-1}(x - y)| dx \\ &\leq 4\|\phi\|_1 + \sum_{j \notin A} \int |\psi_j(x)| \cdot \frac{C\rho_1^{-d}(2^{j-1})C_1^d}{(1 + \frac{C_1|x-y|}{\rho_1(2^{j-1})})^{2d}} dx \\ &\leq 4\|\phi\|_1 + \sum_{j \notin A} \int |\psi_j(x)| \cdot \frac{C\rho_1^{-d}(2^{j-1})C_1^d}{(1 + \frac{C_1 2^{j-2}}{\rho_1(2^{j-1})})^{2d}} dx \\ &\leq 4\|\phi\|_1 + C \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{jd} \frac{\rho_1^{-d}(2^{j-1})C_1^d}{(1 + \frac{C_1 2^{j-2}}{\rho_1(2^{j-1})})^{2d}}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

To estimate the second term in (16) we will use the fact that ρ_1 is non-increasing. Choose the smallest integer $k \geq -1$ such that $C_1 2^k \geq \rho_1(2^k)$ and split the sum correspondingly into two parts (ignore the first part if $k = -1$)

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j \geq 0}^k 2^{jd} \frac{\rho_1^{-d}(2^{j-1}) C_1^d}{(1 + \frac{C_1 2^{j-2}}{\rho_1(2^{j-1})})^{2d}} + \sum_{j \geq k+1} 2^{jd} \frac{\rho_1^{-d}(2^{j-1}) C_1^d}{(1 + \frac{C_1 2^{j-2}}{\rho_1(2^{j-1})})^{2d}} \leq \\ & C 2^{kd} \rho_1^{-d}(2^{k-1}) C_1^d + C \sum_{j \geq k+1} 2^{-jd} C_1^{-d} \rho_1^d(2^k) \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it follows from (16) that

$$\sup_y \int |K(x, y)| dx \leq C$$

where C does not depend on ρ_1 . $\square$

Thus, S is a bounded operator on L^2 whose norm does not depend on ρ_1 . Now we will show that

$$\|S \chi_E f\|_2 \leq C \sqrt{\epsilon} \|f\|_2. \quad (17)$$

Since we have already shown that

$$\sup_y \int |K(x, y)| dx \leq C.$$

it will suffice to prove the next lemma.

Lemma 2

$$\sup_x \int_E |K(x, y)| dy \leq C \epsilon \quad (18)$$

where $C \lesssim C_1^d + 1$.

Proof of Lemma 2. To obtain (18) we will need the following geometrical property:

$$|D(x, r) \cap E| \leq C \epsilon |D(x, r)| \quad (19)$$

for all x and $r \geq \rho_1(|x|)$. This inequality is based on the fact that we can cover $\bar{D}(x, r)$ by disks $D(x_i, \rho_1(|x_i|))$, $x_i \in \bar{D}(x, r)$, such that

$$\sum_i |D(x_i, \rho_1(|x_i|))| \leq C|D(x, r)|. \quad (20)$$

To show this we will use only the continuity of ρ_1 . First we claim that $\bar{D}(x, r)$ can be covered by balls $D(x_k, \rho_1(|x_k|)/3)$ with $x_k \in \bar{D}(x, r)$ and $\rho_1(|x_k|) \leq 3r$. Suppose towards a contradiction that there is $y \in \bar{D}(x, r)$ which is not covered. Then $\rho_1(|y|) > 3r$. Consider $h(t) = \rho_1(|(1-t)x + ty|)$, $0 \leq t \leq 1$. It is continuous and $h(0) \leq r$ and $h(1) > 3r$. Pick t such that $h(t) = 3r$. Let $z = (1-t)x + ty$ then $z \in D(x, r)$, $\rho_1(|z|) = 3r$ and $y \in D(z, \rho_1(|z|)/3)$. It gives us a contradiction. Thus, $\bar{D}(x, r)$ can be covered by balls $D(x_k, \rho_1(|x_k|)/3)$ with $x_k \in \bar{D}(x, r)$ and $\rho_1(|x_k|) \leq 3r$. Next we choose a finite subcover of $\bar{D}(x, r)$ (a compact set) by these balls. Applying a well-known result on covering (see ([10], 7.3)) we can choose a disjoint subcollection of these balls $D(x_i, \rho_1(|x_i|)/3)$ such that $D(x, r) \subset \bigcup D(x_i, \rho_1(|x_i|))$.

We also have $\bigcup_i D(x_i, \rho_1(|x_i|)/3) \subset D(x, 2r)$. Therefore, $\sum_i |D(x_i, \rho_1(|x_i|))| = 3^d \sum_i |D(x_i, \rho_1(|x_i|)/3)| = 3^d |\bigcup_i D(x_i, \rho_1(|x_i|)/3)| \leq 3^d |D(x, 2r)| = C|D(x, r)|$ which gives us (20). Now (19) follows from (20):

$$|D(x, r) \cap E| \leq \sum_i |D(x_i, \rho_1(|x_i|)) \cap E| \leq \epsilon \sum_i |D(x_i, \rho_1(|x_i|))| \leq C\epsilon |D(x, r)|.$$

Since $K(x, y) = \sum_{j \geq 0} \psi_j(x) \phi_{j-1}(x - y)$ has at most three nonvanishing terms for each fixed x and $|\psi_j(x)| \leq 1$, to prove (18) it is enough to show that

$$\sup_x \int_E |\phi_j(x - y)| dy \leq C\epsilon \quad (21)$$

when $x \in \text{supp } \psi_{j+1}$, i.e., $2^j \leq |x| \leq 2^{j+2}$ and therefore $\rho_1(|x|) \leq \rho_1(2^j)$. Let $k_1 \geq 0$ be the smallest integer such that $2^{k_1} \geq C_1$. Therefore, using (19) we

get (21):

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_E |\phi_j(x-y)| dy &= \int_E |\rho_1^{-d}(2^j) C_1^d \phi(\frac{C_1(x-y)}{\rho_1(2^j)})| dy \\
&\leq C \int_E \frac{\rho_1^{-d}(2^j) C_1^d}{(1 + \frac{C_1|x-y|}{\rho_1(2^j)})^{2d}} dy \\
&\lesssim \int_{E \cap D(x, 2^{k_1} \rho_1(|x|)/C_1)} + \sum_{k > k_1} \int_{E \cap D(x, 2^k \rho_1(|x|)/C_1) \setminus D(x, 2^{k-1} \rho_1(|x|)/C_1)} \frac{\rho_1^{-d}(2^j) C_1^d}{(1 + \frac{C_1|x-y|}{\rho_1(2^j)})^{2d}} dy \\
&\leq \epsilon (2^{k_1} \rho_1(|x|)/C_1)^d \rho_1^{-d}(2^j) C_1^d + \sum_{k > k_1} \epsilon (2^k \rho_1(|x|)/C_1)^d \frac{\rho_1^{-d}(2^j) C_1^d}{(1 + \frac{2^k \rho_1(|x|)}{\rho_1(2^j)})^{2d}} \\
&\lesssim \epsilon (C_1^d + 1).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Thus, $\|S \chi_E f\|_2^2 \lesssim (C_1^d + 1) \epsilon \|f\|_2^2$.

Since $S+T=I$, it follows that T is also a bounded operator on L^2 . However, we will need the following lemma for the operator T later which is analogous for **Lemma 1** for the operator S :

Lemma 3

$$\sup_y \int |L(x, y)| dx \leq C. \quad (22)$$

and

$$\sup_x \int |L(x, y)| dy \leq C. \quad (23)$$

where C is an absolute constant and does not depend on ρ_1 .

Proof of Lemma 3. Recall that $\psi_0(x) = q(|x|)$ where $q(r)$ is a function defined on $\mathbb{R}^+$. Using (13) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int |L(x, y)| dx &\leq \|\phi\|_1 \sum_{j \geq 0} |\psi_0(\rho_1(2^j)y/C_1) - \psi_0(\rho_1(2^{j-1})y/C_1)| \\
&\leq C \sum_{j \geq 0} \int_{\rho_1(2^j)|y|/C_1}^{\rho_1(2^{j-1})|y|/C_1} |q'(t)| dt \\
&\leq C \int_0^\infty |q'(t)| dt \leq C.
\end{aligned}$$

We used here the facts that ψ_0 is a radial Schwartz function and ρ_1 is non-increasing.

Now we will show that

$$\sup_x \int |L(x, y)| dy \leq C.$$

We have that $\phi = \check{\psi}_0$ is a real-valued radial Schwartz function. Actually, ϕ can be extended to an entire function of exponential type on $\mathbb{C}^d$. It is clear that $|\widehat{\phi}|(x)$ is a radial function. Here we took the Fourier transform of the absolute value of ϕ . Denote $p(|x|) = |\widehat{\phi}|(x)$ where $p(r)$ is a function defined on $\mathbb{R}^+$. Recall from our definition of $\psi_0(x)$ that $q(|x|) = \psi_0(x)$ is a non-increasing function of $|x|$. Therefore, $0 \leq \psi_0(\rho_1(2^j)y/C_1) - \psi_0(\rho_1(2^{j-1})y/C_1) = \hat{\phi}_j(y) - \hat{\phi}_{j-1}(y)$ since ρ_1 is a non-increasing function too. Let

$$L_n(x, y) = \sum_{j=0}^n 2^{jd} \phi(2^j(x - y)) (\psi_0(\rho_1(2^j)y/C_1) - \psi_0(\rho_1(2^{j-1})y/C_1)).$$

Since $L_n(x, y) \rightarrow L(x, y)$, it is enough to show that $\int |L_n(x, y)| dy \leq C$ to get (23) by an application of Fatou's Lemma. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int |L_n(x, y)| dy &\leq \int \sum_{j=0}^n 2^{jd} |\phi(2^j(x-y))| \cdot (\hat{\phi}_j(y) - \hat{\phi}_{j-1}(y)) dy \\
&= \int \sum_{j=0}^n 2^{jd} |\phi(2^j(x-\cdot))|^\wedge(z) \cdot (\phi_j(z) - \phi_{j-1}(z)) dz \\
&= \int \sum_{j=0}^n e^{-i2\pi xz} |\widehat{\phi}|(\frac{z}{2^j}) \cdot (\phi_j(z) - \phi_{j-1}(z)) dz \\
&= \int e^{-i2\pi xz} \left(|\widehat{\phi}|(\frac{z}{2^n}) \phi_n(z) - |\widehat{\phi}|(\frac{z}{2^0}) \phi_{-1}(z) \right) dz + \\
&\quad \int \sum_{j=1}^n e^{-i2\pi xz} (|\widehat{\phi}|(\frac{z}{2^{j-1}}) - |\widehat{\phi}|(\frac{z}{2^j})) \cdot \phi_{j-1}(z) dz \\
&\leq 2\|\phi\|_1 \cdot \|\psi_0\|_\infty + \sum_{j=1}^n \int_{\frac{|z|}{2^j}}^{\frac{|z|}{2^{j-1}}} |\phi_{j-1}(z)| \int |p'(t)| dt dz. \quad (24)
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used the identity $\int f \hat{g} = \int \hat{f} g$ and summation by parts. Change the order of integration to estimate the second term in (24) by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^\infty |p'(t)| \sum_{j=1}^n \int_{2^{j-1}t \leq |z| \leq 2^j t} \frac{C_1^d}{\rho_1^d(2^{j-1})} |\phi(\frac{C_1 z}{\rho_1(2^{j-1})})| dz dt \\
&= \int_0^\infty |p'(t)| \sum_{j=1}^n \int_{C_1 2^{j-1} t \rho_1^{-1}(2^{j-1}) \leq |z| \leq C_1 2^j t \rho_1^{-1}(2^{j-1})} |\phi(z)| dz dt \\
&\leq \int_0^\infty |p'(t)| \cdot \|\phi\|_1 dt. \quad (25)
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used the fact that ρ_1 is non-increasing. All we need to show now is that $\int_0^\infty |p'(t)| dt < \infty$. To obtain this we will prove that $|p'(t)| \lesssim t^{-2}$ (actually

$\lesssim t^{-2-\frac{d-1}{2}}.$) Recall that ϕ is a real-valued radial Schwartz function which can be extended to an entire function of exponential type on $\mathbb{C}$. Let $g(t) = \phi(t, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$ then $g(t)$ is an even real-valued Schwartz function on $\mathbb{R}$ which can be extended to an entire function of exponential type on $\mathbb{C}$ and $g(|x|) = \phi(x)$. Let $\alpha_k, k = 1, 2, \dots$, be the positive roots of g in increasing order where the function g changes its sign. Let $\alpha_0 = 0$ (note $g(0) = \phi(0, 0, \dots, 0) > 1$). We have

$$p(t) = \sum_{k \geq 0} (-1)^k \int_{\alpha_k}^{\alpha_{k+1}} g(s) \hat{d}\sigma(st) s^{d-1} ds \quad (26)$$

where

$$\hat{d}\sigma(|x|) = \int_{|\xi|=1} e^{-i2\pi x \cdot \xi} d\sigma(\xi) = |\sigma_{d-2}| \cdot \int_0^\pi e^{-i2\pi|x|\cos\theta} (\sin\theta)^{d-2} d\theta \quad (27)$$

is a real-valued radial function. Here $|\sigma_{d-2}|$ is the area of the $(d-2)$ -dimensional sphere. It is well-known that $\hat{d}\sigma(r) = Re(B(r))$ where $B(r) = a(r)e^{i2\pi r}$ and $a(r)$ satisfies the following estimates:

$$|a^{(k)}(r)| \leq \frac{C}{r^{\frac{d-1}{2}+k}}.$$

See, for example, ([11], Ch. viii).

Denote by

$$F(r) = \int_0^r \hat{d}\sigma(t) dt.$$

We need only the facts that $|\hat{d}\sigma(r)| \leq C$ and $|F(r)| = \left| \int_0^r \hat{d}\sigma(t) dt \right| \leq C$ which easily follow from the definition (27) and integration by parts (if $d = 1$ then $\hat{d}\sigma(r) = \cos 2\pi r$ and the estimate is obvious). Actually, it follows from the

properties of $\hat{d}\sigma$ that $|\int_r^\infty \hat{d}\sigma(t)dt| \lesssim r^{-\frac{d-1}{2}}$.) Differentiating (26) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
p'(t) &= \sum_{k \geq 0} (-1)^k \int_{\alpha_k}^{\alpha_{k+1}} g(s) (\hat{d}\sigma)'(st) s^d ds = \\
&= \sum_{k \geq 0} -(-1)^k \frac{1}{t} \int_{\alpha_k}^{\alpha_{k+1}} (s^d g(s))' \hat{d}\sigma(st) ds = \\
&= \sum_{k \geq 0} (-1)^{k+1} \frac{1}{t^2} \int_{\alpha_k}^{\alpha_{k+1}} (s^d g(s))' d\left(\int_0^{st} \hat{d}\sigma(r) dr\right) = \\
&= \sum_{k \geq 0} (-1)^{k+1} \frac{1}{t^2} \left((s^d g(s))' F(st) \Big|_{s=\alpha_k}^{s=\alpha_{k+1}} - \int_{\alpha_k}^{\alpha_{k+1}} (s^d g(s))'' F(st) ds \right).
\end{aligned}$$

We integrated by parts twice and used that $\alpha_0 = 0$ and $g(\alpha_k) = 0$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots$. Since g is an entire function of exponential type, we can bound the number of its roots in the interval $[0, 2^j]$ by $\lesssim 2^j$ which follows from Jensen's formula ([10], p. 309). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
|p'(t)| &\lesssim \frac{1}{t^2} \sum_{\alpha_k < 1} |(s^d g(s))'|(\alpha_k) + \frac{1}{t^2} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{2^j \leq \alpha_k < 2^{j+1}} |(s^d g(s))'|(\alpha_k) + \frac{1}{t^2} \int |(s^d g(s))''| ds \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{t^2} + \frac{1}{t^2} \sum_{j \geq 0} \frac{2^{jd} 2^j}{1 + 2^{2j(d+1)}} + \frac{1}{t^2} \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{t^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Therefore,

$$\int |p'(t)| dt < \infty. \tag{29}$$

Substituting (29) into (25) and using (24) we obtain

$$\int |L_n(x, y)| dy \leq C$$

which gives us the desired estimate (23):

$$\int |L(x, y)| dy \leq C.$$

If we use $|\int_r^\infty \hat{\sigma}(t) dt| \lesssim r^{-\frac{d-1}{2}}$ then we can improve (28)

$$|p'(t)| \lesssim \frac{1}{t^{2+\frac{d-1}{2}}}.$$

□

In particular, it follows that T is a bounded operator on L^2 whose norm does not depend on ρ_1 .

The proof of

$$\|\chi_\Sigma \widehat{Tf}\|_2 \leq C\sqrt{\epsilon}\|f\|_2 \quad (30)$$

is quite similar to the proof of (17). Since we have already shown that

$$\sup_x \int |L(x, y)| dy \leq C,$$

it will suffice to prove the following lemma:

Lemma 4

$$\sup_y \int_\Sigma |L(x, y)| dx \leq C\epsilon \quad (31)$$

where $C \lesssim C_2^d + 1$.

Proof of Lemma 4. Combining with the argument in the proof of (22) it is enough to show that

$$\int_\Sigma 2^{jd} |\phi(2^j(x - y))| dx \leq C\epsilon \quad (32)$$

when $\frac{C_1}{\rho_1(2^{j-1})} \leq |y| \leq \frac{2C_1}{\rho_1(2^j)}$. Therefore, applying (5) we get $\rho_2(|y|) \leq \rho_2(\frac{C_1}{\rho_1(2^{j-1})}) \leq C_2 2^{-(j-1)}$. Repeating an argument similar to the one to obtain (21) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma} 2^{jd} |\phi(2^j(x-y))| dx &\lesssim \int_{\Sigma \cap D(y, \rho_2(|y|))} + \sum_{k>0} \int_{\Sigma \cap D(y, 2^k \rho_2(|y|)) \setminus D(y, 2^{k-1} \rho_2(|y|))} \frac{2^{jd}}{(1+2^j|x-y|)^{2d}} dx \\ &\lesssim 2^{jd} \epsilon (\rho_2(|y|))^d + \sum_{k>0} \frac{2^{jd}}{(1+2^j 2^k \rho_2(|y|))^d} \\ &\lesssim \epsilon ((2^j \rho_2(|y|))^d + 1) \lesssim \epsilon (C_2^d + 1). \end{aligned}$$

□

Thus, $\|\chi_{\Sigma} \widehat{Tf}\|_2^2 \lesssim (C_2^d + 1) \epsilon \|f\|_2^2$.

Therefore the pair of operators S and T possesses the properties we gave at the beginning of the proof of the theorem and we obtain the desired result

$$\int |f|^2 \lesssim \int_{E^c} |f|^2 + \int_{\Sigma^c} |\hat{f}|^2.$$

End of proof of **Theorem 1**. □

It is an open question whether **Theorem 1** holds for every $0 < \epsilon < 1$ but not just for sufficiently small ϵ .

We will give only a sketch of the proof of **Theorem 2** since it is analogous to the proof of Theorem 2.3 in [12]. If μ is a probability measure which is not a unit point mass then the set $F = \{|\hat{\mu}(\xi)| > 1 - \delta\}$ is a complement of a relatively dense one ((2)) if δ is small enough. More precisely,

$$|F \cap [x, x+1]| \leq \epsilon(\delta)$$

for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\epsilon(\delta) \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. The statement is also true in $\mathbb{R}^d$. See for example Lemma 1.1 in [12]. Define similarly F_1 and F_2 correspondingly for μ_1 and μ_2 . If $Q_1(x) = |x|^p$ and $Q_2(x) = |x|^{p'}$ then the sets $E = \{|G(x)| > 1 - \delta\} \subset Q_1^{-1}(F_1)$ and $\Sigma = \{|H(x)| > 1 - \delta\} \subset Q_2^{-1}(F_2)$ are ϵ -thin with respect to $\rho_1(|x|) = \min(\frac{1}{|x|^{p-1}}, 1)$ and $\rho_2(|x|) = \min(\frac{1}{|x|^{p'-1}}, 1)$

correspondingly. Note that $(p-1)(p'-1) = 1$. This is true because Q_1 and Q_2 map discs $D_1 = D(x, \rho_1(|x|))$ and $D_2 = D(x, \rho_2(|x|))$ correspondingly onto intervals $I_1(x)$ and $I_2(x)$ of length $\gtrsim C^{-1}$ since $|\nabla Q_1(x)| \sim \frac{1}{\rho_1(|x|)}$ and $|\nabla Q_2(x)| \sim \frac{1}{\rho_2(|x|)}$ if $|x|$ is large. Therefore,

$$\frac{|Q_1^{-1}(F_1) \cap D(x, \rho_1|x|)|}{|D(x, \rho_1|x|)|} \lesssim \epsilon^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

$$\frac{|Q_2^{-1}(F_2) \cap D(x, \rho_2|x|)|}{|D(x, \rho_2|x|)|} \lesssim \epsilon^{\frac{1}{p'}}$$

since for large $|x|$

$$\frac{|Q_1^{-1}(F_1) \cap D(x, \rho_1|x|)|}{|D(x, \rho_1|x|)|} \leq \frac{|F_1 \cap I_1|}{|I_1|} \cdot \frac{\max_{D_1} \frac{1}{|\nabla Q_1|}}{\min_{D_1} \frac{1}{|\nabla Q_1|}} \lesssim \epsilon$$

and for small $|x|$ it is $\lesssim \max(\epsilon^{\frac{d}{p}}, \epsilon)$. Similar estimates hold for $Q_2^{-1}(F_2)$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Gf\|_2^2 &= \|Gf\|_{L^2(E^c)}^2 + \|Gf\|_{L^2(E)}^2 \\ &\leq (1-\delta)^2 \|f\|_{L^2(E^c)}^2 + \|f\|_{L^2(E)}^2 \\ &= \|f\|_2^2 - (1 - (1-\delta)^2) \|f\|_{L^2(E^c)}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

In a similar way we have

$$\|H\widehat{Gf}\|_2^2 \leq \|\widehat{Gf}\|_2^2 - (1 - (1-\delta)^2) \|\widehat{Gf}\|_{L^2(\Sigma^c)}^2. \tag{34}$$

It follows from **Theorem 1** that

$$\|\widehat{Gf}\|_{L^2(\Sigma^c)}^2 \geq C^{-1} \|Gf\|_2^2 - \|Gf\|_{L^2(E^c)}^2$$

where $C \geq 1$. Therefore, (34) $\lesssim$

$$\begin{aligned} \|H\widehat{Gf}\|_2^2 &\leq \|Gf\|_2^2 - (1 - (1-\delta)^2)(C^{-1} \|Gf\|_2^2 - \|Gf\|_{L^2(E^c)}^2) \\ &\leq (1 - C^{-1}(1 - (1-\delta)^2)) \|Gf\|_2^2 + (1 - (1-\delta)^2)(1-\delta)^2 \|f\|_{L^2(E^c)}^2 \\ &\leq (1 - C^{-1}(1 - (1-\delta)^2)) \|f\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

We used here (33) and the fact $(1 - (1 - \delta)^2)(1 - C^{-1}(1 - (1 - \delta)^2)) \geq (1 - (1 - \delta)^2)(1 - \delta)^2$ since $C \geq 1$. It is clear that $\beta^2 \leq 1 - C^{-1}(1 - (1 - \delta)^2) < 1$. Instead of $Q_1(x) = |x|^p$ and $Q_2(x) = |x|^{p'}$ we can also use $Q_1(x) = \sum_{i=1}^d a_i |x_i|^p$ and $Q_2(x) = \sum_{i=1}^d b_i |x_i|^{p'}$ where a_i and b_j are non-zero real numbers.

Remark 1 *If $Q_1(t)$ and $Q_2(t)$ are increasing convex functions satisfying $C_2 Q_2'(C_1 Q_1'(t)) \geq t$ for all $t \geq 0$ and such that $Q_i'(t + \frac{1}{Q_i'(t)}) \leq C Q_i'(t - \frac{1}{Q_i'(t)})$, $i = 1, 2$ for all large t then Theorem 2 holds with $|G(x)| \leq |\hat{\mu}_1(Q_1(|x|))|$ and $|H(x)| \leq |\hat{\mu}_2(Q_2(|x|))|$.*

3 Counterexamples

Recall that a pair of sets $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is called ϵ -thin with respect to the pair of functions ρ_1 and ρ_2 correspondingly if

$$|E \cap D(x, \rho_1(|x|))| \leq \epsilon |D(x, \rho_1(|x|))|$$

and

$$|\Sigma \cap D(x, \rho_2(|x|))| \leq \epsilon |D(x, \rho_2(|x|))|$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The next lemma shows that the condition (5) $\frac{C_2}{\rho_2(\frac{C_1}{\rho_1(t)})} \geq t$ in the **Theorem** is not only sufficient but also necessary for an inequality of the form

$$\int |f|^2 \leq C(E, \Sigma) \left(\int_{E^c} |f|^2 + \int_{\Sigma^c} |\hat{f}|^2 \right)$$

to hold for every $f \in L^2$ and every pair of ϵ -thin sets E and Σ with respect to ρ_1 and ρ_2 correspondingly.

Lemma 5 *Let $\rho_1 : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\rho_2 : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be continuous non-increasing functions. Suppose that there exists $0 < \epsilon < 1$ such that for*

every pair of ϵ -thin sets E and Σ with respect to ρ_1 and ρ_2 correspondingly we have

$$\int |f|^2 \leq C(E, \Sigma) \left(\int_{E^c} |f|^2 + \int_{\Sigma^c} |\hat{f}|^2 \right) \quad (35)$$

for every $f \in L^2$ then there exist $C_2 > 0$ and $C_1 > 0$ such that $\frac{C_2}{\rho_2(\frac{C_1}{\rho_1(t)})} \geq t$ for every $t \geq 0$.

Proof of Lemma 5: The pair of functions ρ_1 and ρ_2 will be fixed throughout the proof. First we will show that there exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that (35) holds for thin enough sets E and Σ , i.e., there exist $\epsilon_0 \in (0, \epsilon]$ and $C > 0$ such that

$$\int |f|^2 \leq C \left(\int_{E^c} |f|^2 + \int_{\Sigma^c} |\hat{f}|^2 \right)$$

holds for every pair of thin sets E and Σ with thinness ϵ_0 and every $f \in L^2$. Suppose towards a contradiction that this is not true. Then there exists a sequence of f_n and corresponding ϵ_n -thin sets E_n and Σ_n with respect to ρ_1 and ρ_2 with thinness $\epsilon_n < \frac{\epsilon}{2^n}$ such that

$$\int |f_n|^2 > n \left(\int_{E_n^c} |f_n|^2 + \int_{\Sigma_n^c} |\hat{f}_n|^2 \right).$$

Let $E = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n$ and $\Sigma = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \Sigma_n$. Then E and Σ are ϵ -thin with respect to ρ_1 and ρ_2 correspondingly. On the other hand we have

$$\int |f_n|^2 > n \left(\int_{E_n^c} |f_n|^2 + \int_{\Sigma_n^c} |\hat{f}_n|^2 \right) \geq n \left(\int_{E^c} |f_n|^2 + \int_{\Sigma^c} |\hat{f}_n|^2 \right)$$

which contradicts to (35).

Suppose towards a contradiction that for any choice of $C_2 > 0$ and $C_1 > 0$ there exists $t \geq 0$ with the property $\frac{C_2}{\rho_2(\frac{C_1}{\rho_1(t)})} < t$. Then for any arbitraly small

$\epsilon > 0$ we will construct a sequence of ϵ -thin sets E_n and Σ_n with respect to ρ_1 and ρ_2 and a sequence of Schwartz functions f_n with $\text{supp } f_n \subset E_n$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_{\Sigma_n^c} |\hat{f}_n|^2}{\int |f_n|^2} = 0.$$

First we will discuss the 1-dimensional case. To simplify the proof we can assume without loss of generality that $\rho_1 < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\rho_2 < \frac{1}{2}$. Let ϕ be a Schwartz function supported in $[-1, 1]$. Choose an integer $n > 0$ which we will specify later. Let $0 < \epsilon < 1$. Note that the functions $\phi(\frac{x-k}{\epsilon\rho_1(n)})$ have disjoint support for integer k . Define

$$f_n(x) = \sum_{k=-(n-1)}^{n-1} \phi\left(\frac{x-k}{\epsilon\rho_1(n)}\right)$$

and

$$E_n = \bigcup_{k=-(n-1)}^{n-1} [k - \epsilon\rho_1(n), k + \epsilon\rho_1(n)].$$

It is clear that E_n is ϵ -thin with respect to ρ_1 , $\text{supp } f_n \subset E_n$ and $\|f_n\|_2^2 \sim n\epsilon\rho_1(n)$. We have

$$\hat{f}_n(y) = \sum_{k=-(n-1)}^{n-1} e^{-2\pi iky} \epsilon\rho_1(n) \hat{\phi}(\epsilon\rho_1(n)y) = D_{n-1}(y) \epsilon\rho_1(n) \hat{\phi}(\epsilon\rho_1(n)y).$$

Pick an integer $a_n > 0$ which we will specify later. Let

$$\Sigma_n = \bigcup_{l=-(a_n-1)}^{a_n-1} [l - \epsilon\rho_2(a_n), l + \epsilon\rho_2(a_n)]$$

then Σ_n is ϵ -thin with respect to ρ_2 . We have

$$\int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}] \setminus [-\epsilon\rho_2(a_n), \epsilon\rho_2(a_n)]} |D_{n-1}|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\epsilon\rho_2(a_n)}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Sigma_n^c} |\hat{f}_n|^2 &\leq \int_{\Sigma_n^c \cap [-a_n, a_n]} |\hat{f}_n|^2 + \int_{[-a_n, a_n]^c} |\hat{f}_n|^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{l=-(a_n-1)}^{a_n-1} \frac{1}{\epsilon \rho_2(a_n)} \epsilon^2 \rho_1^2(n) + \sum_{|l| \geq a_n} n \frac{\epsilon^2 \rho_1^2(n)}{1 + (|l| \epsilon \rho_1(n))^{100}} \\
&\lesssim \frac{a_n \rho_1^2(n) \epsilon}{\rho_2(a_n)} + \frac{n \epsilon \rho_1(n)}{(a_n \epsilon \rho_1(n))^{99}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Our goal is to make this expression much smaller than $\|f_n\|_2^2 \sim n \epsilon \rho_1(n)$. It will suffice to require that $1 \ll a_n \epsilon \rho_1(n)$ and $\frac{a_n \rho_1(n)}{n \rho_2(a_n)} \ll 1$. Set $C_1 = \frac{k}{\epsilon}$ and $C_2 = \frac{k^2}{\epsilon}$. Then there exists t_k such that $\frac{C_2}{\rho_2(\frac{C_1}{\rho_1(t_k)})} < t_k$. By the way $t_k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ since otherwise ρ_2 would be unbounded. Let $n = [t_k] > 0$. We also have that $\frac{C_1}{\rho_1(n)} \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ since otherwise ρ_1 would be unbounded. Let $a_n = \left\lceil \frac{C_1}{\rho_1(n)} \right\rceil > 0$. Note that $\rho_2(a_n) \geq \rho_2(\frac{C_1}{\rho_1(t_k)}) > \frac{C_2}{t_k}$. Then $a_n \epsilon \rho_1(n) \sim k$ and $\frac{a_n \rho_1(n)}{n \rho_2(a_n)} \lesssim \frac{k t_k}{\epsilon n C_2} \sim \frac{1}{k}$. Let $k \rightarrow \infty$ to obtain the desired result.

Now we will consider the case when dimension $d \geq 2$. The construction here is much simpler and we will just give a sketch. Let ϕ be a Schwartz function on $\mathbb{R}$ supported in $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$. Define for $n > d$

$$f_n = \phi\left(\frac{x_1}{n-d}\right) \prod_{i=2}^d \phi\left(\frac{x_i}{\epsilon \rho_1(n)}\right)$$

and

$$E_n = [-(n-d), n-d] \times [-\epsilon \rho_1(n), \epsilon \rho_1(n)]^{d-1}.$$

Then E_n is ϵ -thin with respect to ρ_1 and f_n is supported in E_n . We have

$$\hat{f}_n(y) = (n-d) \hat{\phi}((n-d)y_1) \prod_{i=2}^d \epsilon \rho_1(n) \hat{\phi}(\epsilon \rho_1(n) y_i).$$

Let $a_n > d$ be a number which we will specify later. Define

$$\Sigma_n = [-\epsilon \rho_2(a_n), \epsilon \rho_2(a_n)] \times [-(a_n-d), a_n-d]^{d-1}$$

then Σ_n is ϵ -thin with respect to ρ_2 . We have

$$\int_{\Sigma_n^c} |\hat{f}_n|^2 \lesssim \frac{n\epsilon^{d-1}\rho_1^{d-1}(n)}{1 + (\epsilon\rho_2(a_n)n)^{100}} + \frac{n\epsilon^{d-1}\rho_1^{d-1}(n)}{1 + (a_n\epsilon\rho_1(n))^{100}}.$$

This expression should be much smaller than $\|f_n\|_2^2 \sim n\epsilon^{d-1}\rho_1^{d-1}(n)$. Therefore it is enough to require that $\epsilon\rho_2(a_n)n \gg 1$ and $a_n\epsilon\rho_1(n) \gg 1$. Set $C_1 = \frac{k}{\epsilon}$ and $C_2 = \frac{k}{\epsilon}$. Then there exists $n > d$ such that $\frac{C_2}{\rho_2(\frac{C_1}{\rho_1(n)})} < n$. Let $a_n = \frac{C_1}{\rho_1(n)} > d$ then $a_n\epsilon\rho_1(n) = k$ and $\epsilon\rho_2(a_n)n > \frac{\epsilon n C_2}{n} \geq k$. Let $k \rightarrow \infty$ to obtain the desired result. $\square$

References

- [1] W.O. Amrein, A.M. Berthier, *On support properties of L^p functions and their Fourier transforms*, Journal of Functional Analysis, vol. 24, 1977, 258-267.
- [2] M. Benedicks, *On Fourier transforms of functions supported on sets of finite Lebesgue measure*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications, vol. 106, 1985, 180-183.
- [3] G. Folland, A. Sitaram, *The Uncertainty Principle*, The Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications, vol. 3, 1997, 207-238.
- [4] V. P. Havin, B. Jorjcke, *The Uncertainty Principle in Harmonic Analysis*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1994.
- [5] O. Kovrijkine, *Some results related to the Logvinenko-Sereda theorem*, Proceedings of AMS, vol. 129, Num. 10, 2001, 3037-3047.
- [6] O. Kovrijkine, *Some estimates of Fourier transforms*, Ph.D. thesis, Caltech, 2000.
- [7] O. Kovrijkine, *A version of the Uncertainty Principle for functions with lacunary Fourier transform*, preprint.

- [8] V.N. Logvinenko, Yu. F. Sereda, *Equivalent norms in spaces of entire functions of exponential type*, Teor. Funktsii, Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen 19, 1973, 234-246.
- [9] F. L. Nazarov, *Local estimates of exponential polynomials and their application to inequalities of uncertainty principle type*, St. Petersburg Math. J. 5(1994), 663-717.
- [10] W. Rudin, *Complex and real analysis*, McGraw-Hill, 1990.
- [11] E. Stein, *Harmonic analysis: real variable methods, orthogonality and oscillatory integrals*, Princeton University Press, 1993.
- [12] C. Shubin, R. Vakalian, T. Wolff, *Some harmonic analysis questions suggested by Anderson-Bernoulli models*, Geom. Funct. Anal. 8 (1998), no. 5, 932–964.
- [13] A. Zygmund, *Trigonometric series, v. I and II*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1968.